FELLOWSHIP

August 1943 Vol. IX—No. 8

All material progress is the infallible result of all moral progress. We cease to waste our strength in a petty war, nor try to defeat interests in detail and without guarantee of permanent success; we strive instead to reach the common source and plant ourselves in the key of the position. The effects of our exertion may appear more slowly, but they are more certain, and alone are durable. The work of faith, the moral work, advances insensibly, like the movement of the hand of the clock, but it alone is called to mark the solemn hours of the nations.

From INTERESTS AND PRINCIPLES,
by Joseph Mazzini; 1836.

Is Christ Divided?

by

WILLIAM TEMPLE and CHARLES E. RAVEN

•

Is Earth for Mirth or Martyrdom? — by Sarah Cleghorn

The Indian as Peacemaker — by Mabel Powers

Parable—1943 — Anonymous

•

The Will to Segregation

by

HOWARD THURMAN

15 cents a copy $1.50 a Year

FROM MY STANDPOINT

John Haynes Holmes

I have received a protest from two conscientious objectors in CPS Camp No. 32 against the American Friends Service Committee as operating CPS camps. This protest indicts the Committee for maintaining "peonage and involuntary servitude." It says: "Assignees (to the camps) are required to work for the U. S. government, without compensation, in violation of their constitutional and moral rights as citizens and free men." The signers of this protest go on to declare that they "will do a fair day's work under compulsion," but "make (their) protest for adequate compensation by a total fast." They add that, if the Committee refuses to permit them to work under these conditions, they will maintain the fast in protest against this refusal, "for by their action the Service Committee will be forcing free men, guilty of no crime, whom they have already wronged, to be jailed."

The first thing I want to say is that I have profound respect for two brave men who are willing to make supreme sacrifice for their convictions. These COs are heroes of the first order, and I know myself to be unworthy so much as to unloose the latchets of their shoes. Nevertheless, in the interest of clear thought and honest speech, I must record my dissent from their opinions.

The second thing I want to say is that I share with these two boys, as with the Friends themselves, dissatisfaction over the work of the CPS camps. These camps offer no perfect, or even adequate, solution of the very difficult problem which they were organized to handle. But they are a genuine experiment that is daily justifying itself if only in demonstrating what can and cannot be accomplished in work camps. They were in the beginning our own idea—the voluntary project of the pacifists themselves, offered to the government on our own initiative. And they have been supported by the Friends and the other peace churches, and by interested and devoted individuals, with a generosity that is impressive. The money raised for the support of these camps by one of the smallest minority groups in the country is a thing to touch the heart. To say, as these two dear boys say, that the American Friends Service Committee, represented by the National Service Board for Religious Objectors, "is guilty of conspiracy with the Selective Service System" against the legal and moral rights of COs is at the best inaccurate and at the worst ungrateful.

Thirdly, I must express my amazement that these two protesters can speak of themselves as "free men" who are being forced to do something against their wills. Where do they get the idea that any men are free in war time? Is it not one of the chief evils of war that it reduces free men to the involuntary servitude of the most diabolical ends that are known to human experience? How free are the ten million men who have been drafted into the army and navy, how voluntary is their armed service for the nation, and how adequate is the compensation they receive? How free is labor under a government that makes distinction between dispensable and indispensable work, that forbids strikes, and that presents the threat of a universal manpower bill binding all men and women to their jobs, whether they like them or not, or are paid adequately or inadequately? How free are any of us in these times to go and come, to do "work of our own choosing," or to determine with any degree of satisfaction the conditions of our daily living? In asking, or expecting, to live in the camps as "free men," these COs are asking for a privilege that nobody enjoys outside the camps. War and freedom simply don't mix. If we want to be free, then we've got to end war. Meanwhile, so long as war is here, conscientious objectors, along with all the rest of us, have got to be content, with whatever protest, to be "cribbed, cabined and confined." And whatever fight they make for freedom must be on behalf not of themselves as a group, but of all men everywhere as stricken by the evil of war.

This brings me to another thing I want to say—and that is that of all men who are suffering dissatisfactions and disabilities these days, we pacifists should be the last to complain. For who are we? A little group of dissenters who, for reasons good and sufficient to ourselves, are refusing to do our part in a war effort involving what our fellow citizens regard as issues of life and death to the nation. The world being what it is, and war being what it is, why should we expect to receive under these conditions anything other than what has been doled out to dissenters from time immemorial—namely, degradation, persecution, and death? If we are spared these sufferings—if we are actually granted, however imperfectly, recognition and protection under the law—shall we straightway complain that things are not entirely to our liking? Or shall we rather be grateful that we may be faithful to our convictions, are still free to bear witness to our ideals, and are serviceable, in however inadequate a degree, to public need? We pacifists must be very humble in times like these. We are asking our fellow citizens to be very patient with us, and we must in return be very patient with them.

Lastly, let it be ever remembered that there is no "involuntary servitude" except as we make it so. This is a phrase of the law and not of the spirit. For by the sheer act of the creative will it lies always within the power of men to take the toil of their days, however outwardly imposed upon them, and make this toil the free choice of their inward souls. This is what I would have the conscientious objectors do in camp or prison. I would have them rejoice that they are suffering for the great cause of peace. I would have them embrace their lives as they would embrace a bride, and thus possess them in love and gladness as their own. Whatever comes to them, these men may say, "This thing I choose to do"—and therewith are they free!

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*

R. ALFRED HASSLER
Managing Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Dorothy Detzer
Eugene Exman
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Amos B. Hulen
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Willis J. King
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Donovan E. Smucker
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

August 1943 — Vol. IX—No. 8

The chasm between pacifist and non-pacifist Christians runs deep indeed. Here two outstanding British protagonists of these two points of view discuss the extent of the division.*

Is Christ Divided?

by

WILLIAM TEMPLE
Archbishop of Canterbury

and

CHARLES E. RAVEN
Dean, Christ's College, Cambridge

IN the field of policy no difference between Christians cuts so deep as that between pacifists and non-pacifists. It is no part of the purpose of this article to stage another argument between these two. Our concern is to appreciate this difference at its full depth, and still show how there is a unity deeper still in the allegiance of each to the One Lord and his teaching.

Both start from a conviction that absolute loyalty is due to God alone, and that we see God in Jesus Christ, who said "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Both are convinced that this loyalty involves us in making love the guiding principle of all our conduct in accordance with the second of the two commandments: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Both recognize with adoring gratitude the supreme manifestation of this principle of love in Christ, who "when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not." Both agree that this outlook condemns both parties to many of the wars that have been waged and leads to the affirmation "that war as a method of settling disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of Our Lord Jesus Christ."[1] Both therefore regard war as a manifestation of sin. Both hold that all elements in political or economic life that are a predisposing cause of war should be removed. Both hope for an ordering of national and international life that will eliminate war from the experience of mankind.

Yet they disagree at the point which for our generation is of crucial importance. The pacifist sees his duty this way.

I

The Christian gospel and the Christian religion proclaim the Cross of Christ as the instrument of salvation —that is, that when Jesus met and defeated evil by refusing either to fight or to flee he revealed the sole means by which evil can be effectually overcome. So long as the early Church accepted martyrdom and the refusal to bear arms as a primary obligation it not only attained a supreme level of individual and collective excellence but it overcame persecution and converted its persecutors: it vindicated the belief that God is love and that therefore love is ultimately irresistible. On the negative side, the example and teaching of Jesus make it plain that evil cannot be overcome by evil and that to do evil that good may come is to deserve damnation. Therefore, when the churches that assembled in the World Conference at Oxford in 1937 agreed to state that war was a demonic evil, pacifists felt that such a statement not only followed the mind of Christ but carried with it an obligation to renounce what had been so defined, since all moral progress depends upon the readiness to say no to acknowledged evil.

The pacifist is convinced that to speak of war, at least in its modern form, as the lesser of two evils is unjustifiable, since no evil is in fact so devilish and so damaging; that to expect it to lead to a righteous peace is illusory, since evil means do not produce good ends; and that to claim that no other alternative exists is apostasy, since it denies the very means that Christ himself used. The issue as he sees it is comparatively simple. Christianity is the good news that evil has been overcome and mankind saved by the adoption of the way of the Cross; to take up the Cross is the condition of discipleship; when once war has been solemnly denounced by the churches, to be a Christian is to be a pacifist.

That to act upon this conviction involves others as well as himself in a possible martyrdom is perhaps the fact that makes it most hard to accept. Yet it is clear that Jesus, in choosing the Cross, frustrated the hopes of his followers, exposed them to a similar martyrdom, and drove a sword

* Taken by permission from the booklet of the same title, published in England by Penguin Books, Ltd., and prepared by the group of British religious leaders known as The Cloisters. Canon Raven is chairman of the British FOR.

[1] Resolution 25 of Lambeth Conference, 1930.

through his mother's heart. These consequences did not deter him, though we may well believe that they added to his agony in Gethsemane. Whether we are pacifists or non-pacifists we involve others in suffering: the pacifist's justification is that he is not merely refusing to fight, but is striving to meet hostility with courage, forgiveness, and generosity, that is, with the instruments which, unlike bombs and starvation, can overcome evil.

That his action implies the belief that even Nazi Germany is not irredeemably evil is again a conclusion which, in face of the evidence and of its deliberate exaggeration by national propaganda, is often hard to maintain. Yet "Father, forgive them" would seem to be a more Christian attitude than that to which Mr. Churchill gives such eloquent expression; and if it be true (as Christians universally profess to believe) that the world is so ordered that evil brings its own ultimate defeat, the notion that we can only hope for a Christian future if Hitler is first smashed would seem to be unduly pessimistic.

That it obscures the difference between right and wrong and shows a defective sense of sin is an argument less difficult to meet. Pacifists, though most of them are skeptical of the white purity of British policy, have no desire and no need to whitewash Nazism or to condone racial persecution, treachery and aggression, the Gestapo, and the concentration camp. But they cannot agree that these evils can be overcome only by methods which in fact imitate them—methods which, as the last war proved and the present war is proving, are indispensable to a people engaged in a life-and-death struggle. The pacifist is not ignoring the fact of evil; he is claiming that it cannot be remedied, but only exacerbated by the methods of war.

That his attitude cuts him off from the majority of his fellow countrymen, weakens their power for victory, and provokes a very natural resentment, is a consequence which the pacifist will fully appreciate, but of which he has no right to complain. He claims that uncompromising loyalty to Christ as acknowledged by the instructed conscience is the truest patriotism, but can hardly expect sympathy under the mass emotions of war. In fact, though there has been some ostracism and petty persecution and a few bad cases of injustice and bullying, the general tolerance and even friendliness of his neighbors have been very unlike what he expected. That a nation mobilized for total war can be in the main so generous is proof that the claim to be defending democracy and freedom is not wholly pharisaical. It is itself an indication that the cleavage, utterly divisive as it seems, is not necessarily final.

II

The non-pacifist reaches a different conclusion and is thereby committed to a different course of conduct. He cannot be unmoved by the exposition of the gospel and its claims which the pacifist offers. A Christian who has never felt a doubt about the claims of pacifism must either be very void of thought about the implications of his faith or very insensitive to its essential quality. There is a real problem for the Christian when his country is at war and, whatever the answer that he finally accepts, he ought to recognize the problem.

The non-pacifist recognizes as fully as the pacifist the inherent sinfulness of war. If there were no sin, there could not be war. It is a primary duty of nations, that is, of men acting as citizens, so to conduct their affairs as to give no occasion for war. But when war has broken out, or when some nation has entered on a course of aggression aiming at tyranny over its neighbors, the non-pacifist may become convinced that his loyalty to Christ itself requires him to fight, and as a citizen to vote for his country's entry into the war. He must not do this light-heartedly. It is a fearful responsibility. But if he takes that course, it is because in the circumstances he believes that his duty as a Christian, not only as a citizen, requires it of him. And now he in turn is deeply pained by the non-cooperation of his pacifist fellow Christians and their apparent acquiescence in what seems to him the possible triumph of the evil principle.

For (to take this war as an illustration) to him it seems that to let Nazi Germany have its way is to close the door to all hope of advance toward Christian civilization for generations to come. He does not fight for the Christian faith itself; that must always be wrong, for it cannot be imposed on others by force, and if his own witness is in question the most potent form of witness is martyrdom. But the Christian faith has combined with other forces to build up a civilization which is partly an expression of that faith and can be made to express it ever more perfectly. A Nazi triumph would put an end to that. And to allow it to do so seems to him disloyalty to Christ. He recognizes that it was by suffering and not by forceful conquest that Christ redeemed the world. He hopes he is ready to suffer without bitterness if duty in war or peace requires him to suffer. But he does not see the relevance of this to such a situation. Indeed he sees, as he thinks, its irrelevance. If Christ had called for the twelve legions of angels to defend him against the soldiers and the temple police, he would have been saving himself alone. But in a war of self-defense (which this war is in part) each citizen is defending his fellow citizens from subjugation to an alien yoke; and in a war for the liberation of other nations from an oppressor (which also this war is in part) each is fighting not only to save his fellow citizens, but to save those of another nation, another tradition, and another culture, which are in danger of being blotted out. The way of fighting is then more apparently the way of the Cross than is the way of detachment, which (apart from prayer in which both alike may join) is alone open to the pacifist.

To the non-pacifist it seems that to call on a whole nation to submit to aggression in the name of Christian discipleship involves a personification of the nation which is a misreading of the facts, while to call on each Christian citizen to stand by while his own or some other nation is ravaged is to ask not for a manifestation of love but for its betrayal.

So the difference cuts very deep. And its importance is not limited to war time. For the pacifist almost inevitably works for reduction of his own country's armaments even though others remain heavily armed; while the non-pacifist may believe that for the sake of peace itself his nation should be heavily armed so long as others are, though he will seek to establish a regulation of all armaments by agreement among the nations leading to a reduction in accordance with an agreed scheme.

Compromise between these two interpretations of Christian duty is impossible. It makes ineffective and dangerous the policy of the non-pacifist; for whatever may be the

strength of the case for disarmament, there is no case at all for inefficient armament; that combines all the evils. And compromise blunts the edge of the pacifist's witness, leaving him to look like a sentimentalist instead of the champion of a stark, austere, and absolute imperative. The difference is profound and incapable of adjustment. It must be recognized at its full gravity if any fellowship of pacifists and non-pacifists is to be genuine and secure against disruption; and, indeed, experience shows that the two groups find mutual understanding intensely difficult; each causes distress and provocation to the other without at all intending or expecting to do so. Let them first appreciate the terrible depth of the gulf that separates them. Then, but only then, they may find that that gulf can be bridged, or rather that it has been bridged and that the bridge-builder is Christ.

III

For these two groups of Christ's disciples, even though their difference remains in all its painful intensity, find as they meet together with him as their leader that in him they are as one. Here is something that unites them despite their disagreement. Indeed, the very poignance of their disagreement makes more vivid by contrast the fellowship which overarches it.

The fact is that one who is a pacifist on the basis of his Christian faith finds that this faith unites him more closely with those who share it even if in the matter of war they oppose him than with those who share his pacifism, but for whom pacifism is differently grounded. Not only have Christians a vast area of agreement, common moral standards, a common philosophy, a shared experience of worship and of prayer, but they are agreed in their verdict upon the present situation to an extent unrecognized by those outside their ranks. For example, hardly any pacifist among them will take up an "absolutist" attitude and insist that the problem of compromise or of conflicting loyalties does not exist for him: on the contrary, most Christian pacifists not only admit that war is a manifestation and symptom of evil, but recognize that they cannot wholly cut themselves off from it so long as they live in any sort of contact with their fellows. Though for themselves they cannot but draw the line at any avoidable participation in war, and are convinced that in the present crisis a repudiation of war is the only course compatible with their discipleship, yet this is a decision to draw the line at this point rather than at another, a matter (so to say) of the strategy of the campaign against evil rather than a difference of principle.

The pacifist says in effect, "The time has come when the Church must deal with war as a century ago it dealt with slavery: to go on acquiescing in this intolerable evil is to ignore the chief issue of our day: it is not only to bring untold misery and untold evil into human life, it is to refuse to employ the one effective method of salvation: we must draw the line here, even if we cannot do so very consistently." The non-pacifist replies: "You misjudge the situation: neither this country nor the world is ready to renounce war; and to do so prematurely is to take a superficial view of evil, to make a grievous tactical blunder, and to involve yourselves in inconsistencies: we do not agree with you that the time is ripe, that war is in fact the supreme manifestation of evil, or that evil can be overcome by dealing with symptoms." Beneath such a difference is rather a diverse judgment on a matter of expediency than a division on the matter of fundamental belief.

Moreover the very fact of their difference underlines for both of them the sense of shortcoming and of humiliation. If men who own the same Lord, who pray and study together, disagree so widely, this is for both parties a challenge to repentance. It convicts both of them of failure, for each has failed to convince the other; it fills them with a common regret, for their division discredits their cause and impedes their witness; it unites them in a shared and timely consciousness of their need for forgiveness; there is no room for self-satisfaction, still less for criticism: it reminds them of their obligation to study, and if need be to rethink their understanding of the faith; it illustrates the vast difference that separates the mind of Christ from our imperfect understandings of him.

It is in this acknowledgment of the lordship and sufficiency of the one Master that Christians find the cleavage over the matter of war less than radically divisive. There are of course on both sides and in certain tempers bitterness of speech and mutual criticism when each is sure of his own rectitude and ready to think of the other as a traitor to Christ. But whether or no pacifism is essential to the gospel, pharisaism is certainly its denial. We cannot judge and revile if we have any real experience of the spirit and presence of Christ.

As we pray together and study together, the faith that unites us creates a sense of fellowship that makes contempt impossible and is stronger than any other bond of agreement. This is a fact of experience to which the two authors of this article can severally testify. They belong, each of them, to many groups in which similarity of interest, social, aesthetic, or political, is the basis of unity: in such groups they have found friendships which cut across all the divisions of nation, creed, or culture. But it is only in company avowedly and primarily Christian that they have found a real unanimity of outlook, a real and organic community. This community, where it has been genuinely realized, has survived the strain of division over the most urgent of all practical issues: indeed, as we have explored and tried to understand the nature of that division, our actual community has in some respect at least been enriched. For we have gained together a clearer vision of Him in whom, as his apostle declared, is neither Greek nor Jew—and perhaps neither pacifist nor non-pacifist—but one man in Christ Jesus.

Contrast

The birds do not know death has threatened the air;
They trill and they carol at dawn, unaware
That they mock with that rapture man's doubt and despair.
The grass does not know, as its green blades upthrust
Toward beneficent sun, with a time-ordained trust,
What life's blood may nurture the roots in their dust.

These look neither backward nor forward; their span
Is brief in eternity's ongoing plan.
The birds and the grass lack the insight of man
Who can take past and future at once in his scope,
Who can walk while the lower creation must grope,
And who, by war's waste, forfeits brotherhood's hope.

ELINOR LENNEN

Is Earth for Mirth or Martyrdom?

By SARAH CLEGHORN

WHEN we look at life with that innocence of the eye that children have, we find nothing contemptible in the cultivation of happiness. At such times, when we are frank and natural, we regard with amazement the idea so often expressed, that "Happiness doesn't matter"; "We're not here to be happy"; "There are values more important than mere happiness."

What are they? What goods take precedence of widespread heartfelt happiness?

Belief in a right doctrine? Obedience to a good rule? Some kind of heroism that makes small account of simple, friendly joy?

Is it patriotism, with its bombers? Revolution, with its purges? Law-and-order, with its iron hand?

Is it heaven? Is it science? Is it art?

It doesn't matter which; for all their champions end by claiming that science, or heaven, or revolution, or law-and-order, however painful *now,* will in the end produce far more happiness than can be reached in any other way.

Of course, with the entrance of this argument, the simple-minded donkey of happiness has pushed himself all the way inside the tent of his opponents.

Whatever has been claiming precedence over happiness proves at last to be claiming nothing more than precedence in time. It only claims to be the forerunner. Sacrifice has to come first, and for a while absorb all our energies, we are told, because only thus can man find happiness, the thing he is really after.

Consider this prevalent doctrine that sacrifice and suffering are the natural road to happiness. The old education was largely based on it. Rulers usually preach it when they contemplate entering war. By it we try to comfort our collective conscience about poverty.

Education, however, has lately become more studious of the impulses and attitudes of the very young, who unabashedly dissent from living out this view. After respectfully observing their pupils, educators have begun to turn the old advice hindside-foremost, thus:

"Make children really happy, and they'll be good."

Believers in loving kindness don't stop with children. They endeavor to practice it also with grown-up people, even with problem grown-ups. They carry their belief into public as well as private affairs, and see no reason why it shouldn't fit classes, nations and races as well as it fits family, friends and neighbors.

Why isn't sunshine as good for people as it is for vegetables? People like it just as well. As the pale shoot weakly struggles toward the tiny window from the forgotten potato in the dark cellar, we too spindle feebly out toward happiness from the mouldy cellar of our man-made woe.

Nor is our simple belief in happiness unverified by experience. We all know how energetically we work when we are happy; what friendly vigor courses through our veins; how neighborly and kind we *feel* (not merely try to act); how cheerful and companionable our families find us—and we them; how free we are from boredom and insomnia. When we are happy we enjoy simple fare, and quiet evenings; the savor of life itself is sweet to us. We need no expensive spices of luxury, or red pepper of excitement. Our wits work better than we supposed they could. We enjoy responsibility. To be good to one another enchants us.

The best imitations of these natural charms of health and contentment are sorry things by comparison. Our feeble struggles against the drag of disheartenment, social discouragement, grief and physical pain are valiant, and do us great honor indeed. Our family and friends love us for them and are tenderly proud of us. But should we propose to continue thus for the rest of our lives—avoiding happiness when it once more *is* available; should we turn into confirmed ascetics, and regard our heroism as an end in itself rather than an emergency substitute for joy, what lunatics we should appear (and be)!

What we really have in mind, I believe, when we belittle happiness, is happiness *limited to ourselves,* a thing the normal human spirit naturally suspects and dislikes.

God bless me and my wife,
My son and his wife,
Us four and no more.

Or else, what we are thinking about is material advantage. We all, of course, know that fortune's favor is not the same thing as happiness. We know happiness is a state of heart. And yet, it seems to me, we can easily be a little too scornful of the useful relation that comfort, security and health—and the money they cost—bear to happiness! If it is faintly disgusting to value them too much, especially for ourselves, how poisonous it is to assure those who lack them, whose strength perhaps is failing for want of them, that "material things have nothing to do with happiness!"

And if there is inequality between our comfort—security—health, and theirs, how venomous is the poison!

It's true that something in us flaps a wing, something emits a low "Hear! Hear!" when we are exhorted to look scornfully on happiness, and admiringly, if not longingly, on martyrdom. "Every heart vibrates to that iron string." Martyrdom, whenever we contemplate it, does give us a soaring lift.

But is it a brew of spiritual gin, producing a sensation of warmth and power indeed, but drawing that warmth away from the heart, and dangerously chilling vitality at its source? Does it lead us too often to love our courage rather than our neighbor, and his courage rather than his joy, rather even than his usefulness?

We know to what delirious deeds the worship of courage and sacrifice has led. Ascetics have studded their clothes with nails pointed inward, have eaten food crawling with maggots, even, with frightful ingenuity, have succeeded in crucifying themselves. And all the time their fellow men near and far have been enduring long want and pain, unsuccored and unremembered. As if conscience, fatally intoxicated by the spiritual pomp and glory of martyrdom, had prayed:

"My exacting God, it takes all my strength to suffer and

die for thee—for my poor fellow mortal there's nothing left."

How could the painful principle of the negligibility of mutual happiness be twisted to agree with the Lord's Prayer when it says,

"Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven"?

Is it in accord with such a petition to insist that life on earth ought to consist so largely of pain and self-denial? And that the natural result of our living good, gentle and brotherly lives will be to infuriate our neighbors, and develop all the evil in their humanity? Will our being good to them make them want to burn us at the stake?

Could such an earth at all resemble the

—sweet and blessed country
that eager hearts expect?

How well would such an earth prepare us for deep, sweet and endless joy? Shouldn't we need a recuperative season on some pleasanter planet than this, in order to acquire the heavenly habit of giving and receiving happiness?

It seems to me we have insulted the Earth, and done a great deal of harm to one another throughout history by placing so gruesome a label on our green and pleasant little home. I think we have condemned Earth without first finding out by brotherly experiments how much like heaven it really could be made.

Martyrdom *at the hands of man* only exists because of harshness and violence in powers that be—official and also natural powers. The more harshly power behaves, the more martyrs it makes. If martyrs are good for Earth, Earth ought to be a lovely place of joy by this time!

But in a blood feud, every martyr on either side warms up the old quarrel, places fresh thorns to crackle under the cooling kettle of hatred, and keeps it boiling. Martyrdom is likewise the chief asset of war, for it alone persuades the nobleness in us to engage in killing our fellow sinners, while featuring and dwelling only on our willingness to die. When creeds were the issue, the orthodox endured martyrdom as bravely as the heretics, and the heretics as bravely as they; the Jews and Turks as bravely as the Christians—and no more so.

And when a gang leader, for killing his gang's enemy, is killed by the law likewise for being the law's enemy, often it happens that he meets his death with admirable, indeed touching, courage; so that thrills of emulation run through the hearts of hero-worshipping boys who are proudly disciplining themselves to follow in his footsteps. The blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church (a bloody church!) but there are many seedling martyrs of many other things than churches. The blood of soldiers has usually been the seed, not of the promised peace, but of the next, and bloodier war. The blood of the executed convict is the seed of crime, not only by way of gangs of ardent boys, but also as nerving desperate men to escape, even if by another murder, from the capture which means death. The persecuted Communists are the seed of communism; but so are persecuted Fascists the seed of fascism.

Martyrs are the red roses which bloom along the thorny hedges of human antagonism, and keep those hedges thick and high. For the more a martyr has been loved, the more his murderers are hated and punished, and thus in their turn erected into marytrs.

But martyrs *to the blind forces of nature!* How different it is with these! They, who perish in trying to save others from flood, fire, or disease, rouse no reprisal by their sacrifice, however thrilling and touching. We cannot hate—perhaps because we cannot punish—nature. We only seek to understand her better, so as to avoid the harm she does. We try, in short, while we honor her martyrs, to get along with her, and find the best harmony we can. O that we would deal thus with brother man!

Martyrs to natural forces win every heart, and soothe away that very hostility and aloofness which martyrs to man keep alive. While a group of Quakers were doing relief work for farmers in Poland after the World War a quarter of a century ago, typhus fever broke out, and the Friends turned from their agricultural projects to fighting the fever and nursing the sick. One of them, a woman, took the fever and died. Filled with grief and affection, the Catholic Poles wished to bury her body in their cemetery; but the priest found on inquiry that it was forbidden. His parishioners said no more, but saw to it that her body was buried just outside the cemetery fence; and on the following night they took up the fence and adjusted it so as to include her loved grave within the consecrated ground.

I shall be sorry if anyone supposes that in hoping to exchange too much martyrdom for the fireside joy of mirth on earth, I mean to praise frivolity. I think, as you do, that frivolity is a pale, shabby substitute for the comradeship and hospitality of mirth, which even Puritan Milton recommended in that immortal *L'Allegro.*

There is certainly a frolic element in normal life that labor alternating only with rest and reflection can never satisfy. We must have fun! Both to express our high spirits, and to revive our low ones. Not alone in youth we need it, but at all ages. Dickens, the novelist of conviviality, had observed with delight the shouts and capers of the old. And wherever he portrays conviviality, Dickens is still a household word. Generations love his mirth who can no longer weep or shudder for his marytrs.

This wanton element in us, whenever starved or suppressed, having sought in vain for play and fun after hard work or monotony, often seeks excitement instead, and finds it in quarrels and ferocities. In asserting itself it sometimes brutally intrudes on others' happiness and savagely spoils it; like the young men in "Rainbow Round My Shoulder," who, finding in the wood tables spread for a church picnic, instead of greedily snatching some food for themselves, left it untasted, but trampled and ruined it all. So the mirthless force themselves upon our startled and indignant attention by extravagances such as dangerous practical jokes, uproars of drunkenness, fierce gambling quarrels, and smashing of property.

What is needed in answer surely is not forced penance in jail, that lamentable failure, but the provision by the community of many more frolicsome activities than now—quite boisterous ones if necessary; enough to sink, in the cleansing oblivion of pleasure and comradeship, all the mockery, drunkenness, mobs, murders, and other manufactured excitements that thrive on the famine of mirth.

To one whose mind dwells on the scattered radiance of loving kindness throughout history, its generous harmonies replacing strife, its simple winsomeness apparent even to weak and disordered minds—even to the persecutor and tyrant—yes, even to wolves and tigers, it seems true indeed that being good to one another is but a light and pleasant burden for mankind to carry, as Jesus said.

After the Armistice—VII

The Will to Segregation

By HOWARD THURMAN

Dean of the Chapel, Howard University

ANY discussion of the relationship between Negro and white people in the year 1943 must examine certain important developments that exercise wide influence in this area.

The first and most important single fact is the war. Under ordinary circumstances the Negro is at most a citizen, second class. He pays taxes on property, participates in the franchise in some sections, and holds a few offices of public trust, but for the most part normal life for him is two or three steps removed from what may be regarded as normal life for other members of the community. At a time of national peril, much of this situation is altered. Even the least citizen begins to count in terms of specific assignments that are deemed essential for survival. Thus war has caused the average Negro to become aware of counting civically in a new way: he is encouraged to buy bonds and defense stamps, he participates in the leadership program, his manpower comes under the selected judgment of the National Selective Service Act, he is involved in Civilian Defense in many of its manifestations, he is taking special training courses for carrying increasing responsibility in defense industry and the farms, he is in the armed forces.

Civic character is possible only where men are permitted to carry civic responsibility. With this new sense of civic responsibility, a new kind of civic character is beginning to appear. This new character, although occasioned by the war, makes for the development of a more careful regard for the future not only of democracy but also the particular future of the Negro in labor, professions, politics, etc. In a sense it is like the coming of age when the first full bloom of manhood possesses the mind and the body. It is unfortunate that it took a global war with its concomitant effect upon our national life to give the Negro a fresh sense of significance and power.

The second significant development stems from the fact that it is no longer possible merely to define national aspirations in terms of "making the world safe for democracy"; it is necessary now to talk concretely in terms of the four freedoms, adding footnotes to make them more definitive and less general than they would appear on the surface. The Axis nations have made clear their goals in terms of a thorough-going fascism, and have thus defined their political, social and economic philosophy. The United Nations must be just as concrete and specific. Mere slogans are completely meaningless. High ranking government spokesmen in public utterances are defining democracy in language that the simplest man can understand.

Meanwhile, the diseases in the body politic become much more acute in the minds of less privileged persons such as Negroes. As these diseases are exposed to the searching diagnosis of the meaning of democracy, the gulf between the dream as uttered and the idea as practiced is wide, abysmal, and deep. *The measure of the frustration of Negroes is in direct proportion to the degree to which the meaning of democracy is made clear and definitive.* We behold then the spectacle of the Negro with a new civic character growing out of a new sense of civic and social responsibility, yet caught in the grip of a deeper frustration and restlessness than he has ever known.

In the third place, the fact that we were attacked by Japan has aggravated greatly the tension between the races. I am not suggesting that the war between Japan and the United States is a race war, but certainly many people have thought of it in terms of a non-white race "daring" to attack a white race. This has given excellent justification for the expression of the prejudices against non-white peoples just under the surface of the American consciousness. There has been a relaxation of mutual regard and respect between the races in many walks of life where these previously existed. This has made for definite reactions on the part of Negroes, often reactions in kind with increasing bitterness, intolerance, hatred.

And in the fourth place, the attitudes described above have been met by an increasing determination and grimness on the part of white Americans. It seems perfectly clear to them that Negroes everywhere are getting out of their place. The argument runs like this: "Negroes do not know what to do with their new sense of significance. They are flippant, arrogant, bigoted, overbearing. Therefore, they must be curbed, held in check so that when the war is over they may drop quickly back into their prewar secondary citizen status." With this kind of situation facing the two groups in America, what can be done?

The "Will to Segregation"

The most fundamentally important thing that must be done is to relax the "will to segregation" that through the years has become the American technique for the control of the Negro minority. This "will to segregation" has taken the form of policy in business, in the church, in the state, in the school, in living zones. Let us examine this "will to segregate."

It is important to realize that segregation can exist only between peoples who are relatively weak and relatively strong, respectively. The strong may separate themselves in certain ways from the weak, but because the initiative remains in their hands they are ever at liberty to shuttle back and forth between the proscribed areas. The weak can only be segregated because, lacking the initiative, they cannot move at will between the proscribed areas. A simple case in point may be observed on any Southern train carrying day coaches. Members of the train crew, who are white, often sit in the section of the coach designated for Negroes. They may sit, by custom, in either section. The train porter, who is a Negro, may sit only in the Negro coach. White passengers move at will from one section to the other, but the passengers in the Jim Crow car some-

times experience difficulty even in passing through the other coaches en route to the diner. Waiters in the diner must always use the toilet facilities in the Jim Crow coach, while white members of the train crew may use either facilities.

The psychological effect of segregation on both groups is the critical issue. For segregation dramatizes a stigma, and becomes a badge of inferiority. A group segregated systematically over many generations experiences a decisive undermining of self-respect. For the sensitive, it means a constant, persistent resentment that is apt so to disease the personality that mental health is critically attacked. It is easy to say that the sensitive should resist segregation without including in their resistance the persons who are directly responsible for the laws and the social patterns that uphold them, but there are many who regard such a position as mere romanticism.

For the less sensitive there is ever the possibility of the acceptance of segregation, with its concomitant conscious admission of inferiority, of humiliation, of despair. Men who are despised, or who are treated systematically as if they were despised, are apt eventually to despise themselves. There is a sense in which society is a mirror through which individuals and groups see themselves reflected. It requires the veriest kind of vigilance and wide awareness to resist the temptation to accept the judgment of society upon one's group. Society sets the mode or the frame of reference that is apt to determine judgment. It is in an effort to overcome this that minority groups seem inclined to develop tendencies towards chauvinism, racism and other manifestations of the "cult of segregation."

More than all of this there is at least one great fear growing out of segregation: the fear of violence. The fear of physical violence is characteristic of most human beings and other animals, but among the segregated the fear takes on a heightened significance because they are so circumscribed by society that exposure to direct violence is ever present and there are no particular types of behavior that may guarantee immunity. The basic fact is that when human beings are segregated they provide a "tethered goat" on whose innocent and unsuspecting head vengeance may be poured for deeds infinitely removed from anything for which they may have responsibility. The ghetto and the Negro section are always present and into them may be dumped releases from frustration and from social and economic blunders, and revenge for private wrongs that originate in a world into which the victims are not even permitted to enter. *To the extent to which this is true the mere fact of being alive provides a specific liability over and above the normal fate of the average man!*

This fear of violence is not traceable merely to the fear of death. To accommodate oneself to the fact of death is one of the basic elements in a normal adjustment of life. Everyone knows that for him death is inevitable; "one by one the duties end; one by one the lights go out." But the fear of violence is a part of the fear that man has of dying out of his bed; dying under circumstances that degrade and debase; dying like a dog in an alley, or a rat in a gutter. Death by accident, or as a result of some freakish act of nature has some of the elements of horror that are present here, but such deaths have in them something that is clean, unconscious, whole. But to be killed by other men without benefit of purpose or great cause is to die ignobly and in shame. The last thread of dignity and worthfulness is stripped from personality and death under such circumstances is sordid, nasty, ghoulish.

The result of this fear makes for a definite alteration in the behavior pattern. Very early the tendency is to make the body commit to memory the ways of behavior that may reduce the exposure to immediate violence. This explains in large part why there is so little organized resistance against segregation. Each new generation of children is psychologically and socially conditioned in an effort to reduce the exposure to spasmodic, irresponsible, systematic, and calculating sadistic impulses. The injury to personality is far greater than can be adequately grasped even by the most sensitive. To be denied freedom of movement, freedom of participation in the common life, is to have the ground of personality value seriously shaken. When in moments of national crises the segregated are granted temporary citizenship, one of the first acts is to attack segregation. This is a sound instinct of self-preservation and it provides the opening for all people of good will to give concrete expression to their commitments.

The effect of segregation on the part of the white group is just as deadly. It gives them a false sense of superiority. What is in essence a superiority of advantage becomes rationalized into superiority based upon logical, physical and spiritual difference. It is impossible for a white child to grow up in an atmosphere in which normal impulses of friendliness must be constantly short-circuited so as to apply only to his own kind, without there dawning upon him that the fact of this difference in attitude is not due to a difference in superior essence. The mind becomes a seed-bed of all kinds of fears and superstitions with reference to Negroes, and if there is nothing in the environment at home or abroad to counteract these fears they become facts on the basis of which the life is planned and years are fulfilled. *All emphasis on brotherhood or love inherent in the Christian religion is doomed to recognize these "fear facts" as extenuating circumstances in which love and brotherhood are not supposed to be effective!*

Therefore, unless the "will to segregate" is relaxed there can be no sound basis of hope for the fulfillment of the dream of democracy in this life of ours.

The Church's Task

For the church this means a radical internal reorganization of policy and of structural change. I am realistic enough to know that this cannot be done overnight. My contention is that if the "will to segregate" is relaxed in

VIGNETTES

I saw a smile illume a face —
Dark of its swarthy race;
And heard a peal of laughter,
Golden-fine
As thine.

I heard grief's sombre muted note
Rise from a dusky throat;
And saw a falling tear-drop,
Crystalline
As mine.

EDWIN MCNEILL POTEAT

the church then the resources of mind and spirit and power that are already in the church can begin working formally and informally on the radical changes that are necessary if the church is to become Christian. This of course, may not mean that there will be no congregations that are all Negro, or that are all white, but freedom of choice, which is basically a sense of alternatives, will be available to any persons without regard to the faithful perpetuation of the pattern of segregation upon which the Christian church in America is constructed.

How dare we undertake to teach reverence to children when we ourselves do not believe in reverence for life in general or life in particular as a valid concept in our kind of world? Shall we teach lies to children? How dare we proclaim sincerity and genuineness as essential qualities for healthy living if in our innermost selves we do not have confidence in the survival values of such ideals of living? Can we teach trust when we are bound by a vast network of impersonal social relations which create the kind of climate in which trust cannot possibly thrive? Or can we teach trust even as we confess how little of trust we have in each other, in our cause and in our God? I wonder. What do we mean when we teach the brotherhood of man, when over and over again we give the sanction of our religion and the weight of our practice to those subtle anti-christian practices expressed in segregated churches and even in segregated graveyards! Can we expect more of the state, of the body politic, of industry than we expect of the church? How can we teach love from behind the great high walls of separateness?

A Man's Task

But more personally, what must a man do who wishes to work effectively on this problem within the framework of Christian ethics?

In the first place I must see to it that what I condemn in society, I do not permit to grow and flower in me. The will to discriminate against other men must be rooted out of the springs of my own action.

But even if my heart is pure, my motives above reproach and my personal action unequivocal and positive, this is not enough. I must share the guilt of my age, my society, and my race. Therefore, I must exhaust all possible means that do not conflict with my ends for bringing about the kind of society in which it is possible for men to live in large groups without external limitations, to experience the good life. This means that for my second action I must put my creative mind to work in the devising of techniques, personal and group, for the achievement of these ends.

High among these techniques are those that belong in the general classification of moral suasion, attempts to make individual and social conscience articulate with reference to a specific sin. Moral suasion has only one serious limitation: the amount of moral atrophy that has taken place in the mind and character of the persons who are to be aroused. I must be patient. I must keep working and persuading and appealing on the assumption, of course, that all men are the children of God—the good and the bad. This means that the Christian will brood over the hearts of men as the living instrument of the spirit of God until there is a stirring of consciousness both of sin and of sonship in their hearts.

The third type of personal action is even more difficult because a conflict of loyalties makes the decision of positive Christian action in a given situation very difficult to determine. There may be a conflict between my loyalty to the ideal brotherhood viewed with reference to the weak, and my kinship with them. The strong are my brothers as truly as the weak are my brothers. I am apt to be caught between the recognition of fundamental kinship with the strong, and the desperation of the weak. Or the conflict may arise from a completely ethical demand of my religion that I wash my hands of the doers of iniquity and leave them to go on their recklessly destructive way, feeling that there are some types of struggle in which even God does not demand that I participate. I may say this type of action is not for me and to all the pull of the needy who are on the receiving end of the violence of the wicked I may turn a deaf ear—if I can.

But I may decide that I cannot wait for the thing to work itself out. There is too much agony, too much hunger, too much poverty and misery everywhere, too many flagrant denials of kinship and brotherhood all along the line. Something concrete must be done now. To wait for moral pressure to work its perfect work may be too late.

What do I do then? I may resort to the exercise of some form of shock, by organizing a boycott, or widespread non-cooperaiton, or the like. The function of these techniques is to tear men free from their alignments to the evil way, to free them so that they may be given an immediate sense of acute insecurity and out of the depths of their insecurity be forced to see their kinship with the weak and the insecure. Men do not voluntarily relinquish their hold on their place. It is not until something becomes movable in the situation that men are spiritually prepared to apply Christian idealism to un-ideal and unchristian situations. Examples of these techniques are being developed by FOR groups and others in different parts of the world even now.

Action of this kind requires great discipline of mind, emotions and body to the end that forces may not be released that will do complete violence both to one's ideals and one's purpose. All must be done with the full consciousness of the Divine Scrutiny.

"He who loses his life. . . ."

Let any Negro, or white friend of the Negro people, sit down some time and ask himself how often he has been willing to die to see Jim Crow abolished—yes, how often he has been willing to risk a little unpopularity, a day in jail, the loss of a job. White people generally have bad consciences about Jim Crow and want to "do something about it," but as soon as it appears that this may result in some disturbance, they draw back. They think God will be indulgent. In this case there will be remission of sins without shedding of blood. But if there is any sense in the Christian symbol of the Cross at all, this cannot be.

There will be suffering, there will be a fearful price to be paid for removing Jim Crow. . . . Except as Negroes and whites take up the Cross of suffering for its removal, it cannot be done away.

A. J. MUSTE, in
What the Bible Teaches about Freedom

A NEW PICTURE OF THE AMERICAN 'SAVAGE'

The Indian as Peacemaker

By MABEL POWERS*

FEW people would regard the Indian as Peacemaker. However, the story of some of his peacemaking ideas and methods is interesting. Most people are familiar with such Indian expressions as "burying the hatchet," and "smoking the pipe of peace." But how many ever heard of "setting up sticks" to settle a quarrel? If two Seneca boys fell to quarreling, the mother would say, "Go set up your sticks." This meant that the boys were to go some distance from the lodge and set up three sticks in tripod form. The quarrel must be left with the sticks for one moon (month). At the end of that time the position of the sticks determined who was right. If they had fallen down, which usually happened because of wind and rain, neither one was right. At the end of the moon, they usually could not even remember what the sticks had been set up for.

Young braves sometimes settled a dispute by making an excavation in the ground. The disputants would then talk their grievances into this hole, literally unburdening themselves. The earth would then be replaced and stamped down, and the quarrel would remain buried as long as the earth was not removed from the filled-in place.

Treaties and tribal pledges were made with a sense of honor. Representatives of tribes concerned met in council and formulated their terms of peace. The great pipe was then passed to confirm the agreement. When all had smoked, the participants were bound by the most sacred of rites to keep the pact, for the smoke of the pipe was "the breath of the Great Spirit entering their hearts."

As seals of friendship and honor, Indians gave belts of wampum, into which had been woven the story of their treaty covenant. Wampum was made from sea- and fresh-water shells cut into beads of various sizes and colors. There were belts for peacemaking or for declaring war, for nominating and condolence, gift belts, and many other kinds.

One of the oldest wampum belts is the one which the Leni Lenape sachems delivered to William Penn at the celebrated treaty under the elm tree at Shackamaxon, in 1682.

The Washington Covenant Belt is a beautiful symbol of the great peace which the Iroquois made with Washington and the thirteen original states (the Thirteen Fires). It is 6 feet, 3½ inches long, 5¼ inches wide. Symbolic figures of men with outstretched arms and clasped hands extend along its length. In the center is the figure of a house with an open door and gabled roof, which shelters two men standing on either side. These two figures represent the Keepers of the East and West Doors of the Iroquois Long House. The other thirteen men represent the Thirteen Fires. There the red and white men stand clasping hands in friendship signifying the peace and good feeling which Washington brought about between the races. This belt is in the New York State Museum at Albany.

There was once on this continent a league of nations that achieved a peace for many years. The story of the formation of this league is woven into what is known as the Hiawatha Belt, now in the New York State Museum. The background is a purple beaded mat 21½ inches long and 10½ inches wide, made of cylindrical beads cut from the purple spot in the clam shell. A symbolic design consisting of four hollow squares and the figure of a tree, or heart, in the center is worked into it in white beads. The five united symbols signify the five nations of which the Onondaga nation was the heart, or guardian, of the Tree of Peace.

During the sixteenth century there lived in the territory now known as New York, and extending to the lower Susquehanna River, five powerful fighting tribes: Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, Seneca. At this time there came among these tribes a great Peacemaker, named Deganawida, who brought to these warring people the idea of uniting into a league of nations to stop for all time the shedding of blood by violence, and by means of laws of justice, brotherhood, and common well-being to establish peace among themselves, for all who joined the league became as fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters. The purpose of the league was to be accomplished by applying three principles: sanity of mind and health of body; righteousness and justice in thought, speech, and conduct; physical strength and spiritual power attained through sacred ceremonial life.

Decisions must be unanimous in the federal council composed of forty-nine chiefs, some of whom were women. Each nation was independent; yet all were bound together for the common good by representatives sent from each to the council. Chiefs must have unlimited tolerance and patience. They must have health of mind and body; evil must not lodge in their minds. They must listen to the Great Spirit, then they would have but one mind, one soul, and one tongue. All served without compensation.

The league gave women unusual rights and privileges. No chief could be nominated without their consent and they could depose any chief neglectful of duty. Mothers could forbid their sons going on the warpath, and *no nation could declare war on another nation without the consent of the women.*

These were some of the principles of the first League of Peace on this continent. The first convert to this new order of life was an Onondaga chief called Ha'hyowe't'ha. This man, later known as Hiawatha, became the spokesman of the movement. The hero of Longfellow's poem had nothing to do with the real Hiawatha who helped to found the first Indian league of nations.

After a number of years, through the unceasing efforts of Deganawida and Hiawatha, four nations accepted the

* Mabel Powers is the author of *Stories the Iroquois Tell Their Children, Around an Iroquois Story Fire,* etc. The above article is reprinted from THE CLASSMATE *by permission.*

league; the Onondaga alone stood out. This nation was under the control of a powerful war chief. To win this war chief and his tribe, Deganawida proposed that he be made the head of the League of Peace and his nation be given first place in the council.

In the dramatic installation scene enacted in the forests of New York centuries ago, the mother of Deganawida, representing all the mothers of the tribes and symbolizing the wisdom and power of woman, placed the deer horns, the symbol of chieftainship, on the head of the new peace chief.

The symbol of the league was an evergrowing tree, the Tree of Peace. Some twenty-five nations eventually joined the league. Wampum records state that all delegates were required to withdraw at sunrise and meditate on peace until sunset. They did this for seven suns. At the end of the seven days' retreat they discussed their problems.

To overcome the military spirit of the age by pacific means, and to achieve a lasting peace among themselves was a great accomplishment. The five nations never again waged war among themselves; but through stress of conditions that arose later, they became tragically involved in wars of defense "to preserve their Tree of Peace," and like all other peoples, before and since, resorted to force. It is heartening, however, to know that red men in 1570 achieved a peace league in America that persisted for over three centuries. Dr. John Finley says of this league: "The Iroquois achieved a social and political organization that has never been equaled or surpassed in its working value of justice, democracy, and brotherhood of spirit."

Parable—1943

ANONYMOUS

THERE was once a wicked tyrant who hated truth. "The world clings to silly, old-fashioned concepts it should have outgrown," he argued. "We have long believed that when we added two apples to two apples we got four apples. We need five apples, but due to the sheer nonsense of arithmetic, we are satisfied with four apples. We want plenty for everybody. Therefore let us preach that two plus two equals five."

There were others in the nation who, never knowing or never believing truth, were willing to follow the new leader. They helped institute a new series of textbooks that taught that two and two were five. Old books were suppressed. A "new order" in arithmetic was announced. Many people not well grounded in truth began to believe.

"It may sound a little strange at first," they said. "But the sounds are real. We can hear with our own ears that two and two make five. We can see it with our own eyes, in newspapers, in books, on posters."

But people in surrounding countries laughed at them.

"Your crazy notions will get you into trouble," they warned. But they said nothing of the truth the misguided people needed.

The misguided people did not like being denounced.

"We will prove we are right," they said. "We will go further than theories on paper." So they built huge concrete monoliths which had the shape of the figures

$$2 + 2 = 5$$

The surrounding countries were horrified by this latest outrage on truth.

"Our culture, our civilization—everything we hold dear—is threatened. We must preserve freedom of thought. This lie must be wiped out." So they adopted defense measures. Their radios, newspapers, and billboards proclaimed a counterslogan:

"Two and two are NOT five."

Concrete monoliths to this effect were erected hastily all over the land of the surrounding countries.

Relations between the *truth-haters* and the *lie-haters* became more and more tense until they could no longer stand the strain. Bombing planes began to fly back and forth between them, blasting each other's radio stations, newspapers, and cities.

The *lie-haters* bent all their efforts to building up their property as fast as it was destroyed. All young men flew bombing planes over enemy territory. Only women, children, and old men remained at home.

"Truth will be, must be, victorious," said they.

I saw an old man mixing concrete for a monolith.

"It will be the biggest ever built," he said.

"Perhaps so," I answered. "But if two and two do not equal five, what do they equal?"

"Fifth columnist," he muttered.

Next I saw a woman putting up posters.

"Tell me, kind lady," I said, "how much are two and two?"

"Oh, I've forgotten," she said. "I'm too busy putting up posters. Ask my son. He learns those things in school."

I found her boy working in an airplane factory.

"Sonny," I said, "tell me how much are two and two."

He looked up at me sadly.

"They don't teach us arithmetic at school any more. Only how to make bombing planes."

I was beginning to despair of finding anyone in the lands of the *lie-haters* who knew the truth. But one day I ran across a young man sitting under a tree reading a book. I was quite surprised at the sight of him.

"Young man," I said, "why are you not out flying a bombing plane, destroying lies?"

He smiled at me, and showed me his book. On its cover was the title: *Truth*. I opened the book, and on its first page was written *"Two plus two equals four."*

"That is truth," I said.

"Yes."

"You believe in truth, but you don't fight for it?"

He smiled at me. He watched a bombing plane disappear over the horizon. Finally he spoke.

"Odd, isn't it?"

News from the Peace Front

Negro Group Votes Non-Violence Campaign; FOR Leaders Speak

In a move fraught with significance for race relations in the United States, delegates to the "We-Are-Americans-Too" Conference of the March on Washington Movement, held in Chicago June 30-July 4, voted unanimously to engage in a campaign of non-violent direct action against Jim Crow customs and laws.

The campaign will be carried on in each of the twenty-six cities in which the MOWM has chapters, and in each city will be built around a nucleus of fifteen "informed and cause-conscious" members, including at least one national officer. Local and national training institutes in the techniques of non-violent direct action will be established.

The Convention attracted crowds of more than two thousand Negroes during its five-day life. Speakers included A. Philip Randolph, national director of the movement; Bayard Rustin and James Farmer, secretaries of the Fellowship of Reconciliation; E. Stanley Jones, famous missionary and FOR member; Pauline Myers, executive secretary of the MOWM; Dean William Stuart Nelson, of Howard University; and J. Holmes Smith, former missionary to India and FOR member.

Cities selected for first attention in the new campaign are Richmond, Washington, New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Free India Picketers Arrested in Washington

Pearl Crist, FOR member and temporary worker in the national office, was arrested on Monday, July 19 for picketing the embassy in Washington, and was sentenced to five months in jail.

Six FOR members were arrested on two successive Mondays for picketing the British embassy in Washington with signs urging immediate freedom for India.

Jane Fulton, of Pittsburgh, Pa.; Harold Lefever, of York, Pa.; and Marjorie Kendrick, of Washington, inaugurated the campaign, which is scheduled to continue "until Gandhi is released or begins another fast," on July 5. They were arrested, but were released on personal bond after promising not to picket again without first notifying the judge.

A week later, on July 12, Carolyn Schmidt, Richard Stryker, and Romain Zahm, all of the Newark Ashram, took up the campaign and also were arrested. Zahm was remanded to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for having walked out of CPS camp. The other two were given the maximum penalty of sixty days in jail and $100 fine, with the alternative to paying the fine of a term of 160 days.

The campaign is being sponsored by the Free India Committee, with the Non-Violent Action Committee of the FOR and the War Resisters League cooperating in recruiting volunteers.

Growing Alarm Felt for Imprisoned COs

Increasing alarm is being felt by relatives and friends of the more than 1,500 conscientious objectors in federal prisons, over inability to communicate with men who are suffering severe repressive measures.

Several of the men, coming headlong into conflict with vicious, anti-democratic rules and practices in the prisons, have made their protest by going on work or hunger strikes. In many such cases the prison administration has countered immediately by coercive measures designed to break the spirits of the men, at the same time placing them practically incommunicado by drastic reduction or total elimination of correspondence and visiting privileges.

Within recent months so many such situations have arisen as to move pacifist leaders to strong protest to individual wardens and to the Bureau of Prisons in Washington. Individual members of the FOR and other pacifists and liberals also are being urged to write their protests to the same persons.

About a dozen men in the Lewisburg (Pa.) Prison now are believed to be engaged in a joint work and hunger strike, although specific information is lacking. The warden of this prison reportedly told one of the men that, "When you came inside those gates you left all your rights behind!"

Pacifist leaders also are registering their protests with the Bureau of Prisons over the severe censorship applied to both incoming and outgoing mail of imprisoned COs even in normal times. The men are not allowed to write anything at all about their fellow prisoners or about conditions or events inside the prison. Pointing out that such censorship was imposed originally in order to prevent escape attempts, friends of the COs outside argue that these men will make no attempt to escape and should be allowed to communicate freely with anxious relatives and friends.

FOR Member Chooses Jail Rather than Segregation

Melba Rosalyn Wilson, FOR member from Columbus, Ohio, chose a night in jail and a $25 fine recently rather than submit to Jim Crow rules in a Southern bus.

Mrs. Wilson, whose husband and two brothers are in the army, made a hurried trip to Danville, Virginia, because of the grave illness of her father. During her stay there, according to the Ohio State edition of the *Pittsburgh Courier,* she had occasion to board a city bus, on which only two other passengers, both white, were riding.

"I took the third seat from the front and rode four blocks before I was asked by the operator to move," she related. "A number of thoughts went through my mind, but I found I could not make myself move."

When the efforts of another driver, summoned hastily, also failed to persuade her to go to the Jim Crow section, police arrested her and took her to the city jail.

Forerunners Work Grows

Ministers and other religious leaders on the faculties of summer camps and assemblies this summer report a noticeable interest among young people in the program and materials of The Forerunners, new FOR-sponsored organization for high-school-age young people. Action Kits and supplies of studybooks, leaflets and other printed materials are on display in many such camps and are being widely circulated.

An effort now is under way by the national office to enlist the help of directors of Christian education in individual churches to include Forerunners studybooks in their Fall programs. A new "broadside" is being mailed to such persons all across the country soliciting such cooperation.

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.; *Midwest:* (Not yet filled), 740 Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Caleb Foote, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo Street, Los Angeles, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 3441 West 39th Ave., Denver, Colo.; *Rural:* Warren Nelson, Merom, Ind.; *Refugee:* Marion Frenyear, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

First Fall Conferences September 24 - 26

The first of the Fall conferences of the FOR will be held in Chicago, September 24 through 26, in the Bethany Biblical Seminary and the First Church of the Brethren. Subsequent conferences—all of them taking the place of the usual national conference because of transportation difficulties—will be held in Philadelphia, Nashville, and at several points in the West.

Although final details of the conferences have not yet been arranged, one major feature will be the reports of the dozen "commissions" created at the last meeting of the National Council to consider various major problems in connection with the post-war world.

A preliminary "retreat" by members of the staff, National Council, and commissions, is scheduled for the Labor Day weekend.

Dates of other conferences are expected to be announced within the month. The Chicago conference is the only one definitely settled as to date, although it is known that the Philadelphia meetings will be held either the first or second weekend of October.

Coast Groups Wage Hate Campaign

A campaign of hatred and vilification of all Japanese-Americans, designed to follow up the "advantages" gained when these people were evacuated from the West Coast, is now in full swing. Described by observers as "smoothly engineered and organized," the campaign was touched off by the reported execution of American flyers in Japan.

Dramatizing the work of the "pressure groups" behind this campaign is the current "investigation" by the Dies Committee, through whose hearings the most fantastic falsehoods are being foisted on the American public.

Behind the campaign are such groups as the Joint Immigration Committee, the American Legion and other veterans' groups, and the Native Sons and Daughters of the Golden West. Another similar group, organized by a Sacramento lawyer, is the Home Front Commandos, on the cover of one of whose publications appear the words:

"Slap the Jap — Treacherous, faithless, untrustworthy, irresponsible, inhuman, depraved, ungodly, soulless, disloyal."

The "Commandos" warn Californians to watch out for "pacifists, sob-sisters, the religious cliques, and the brotherly-love gang," for "unless something is done the Long Hairs will put (the Japanese-Americans) back on your farmlands, as your neighbors, your business competitors. . . . The Japs now thoroughly hate us. Do you want them as neighbors, to poison your water, kill your cattle, destroy your orchards?"

CO Refused Right to Teach in Kentucky

A conscientious objector cannot be employed as a public school teacher in Kentucky, according to a decision handed down by Assistant Attorney General W. Owen Keller of that state, recently. Keller, pointing out that a teacher may be discharged for "immorality, misconduct of office, incompetency, or wilful neglect of duty," wrote: "It would seem that the individual in question (a CO recently released from CPS camp) is guilty of all the offenses thus included."

"A teacher," he continued, "should encourage personal honesty, personal courage, love of God and love of country. A conscientious objector cannot be personally honest who would ask for a position as teacher in the public school system, because he is asking the government which he refuses to defend to pay him a salary in money for his services.

"He cannot have personal courage or he would not cravenly flee from the duties imposed upon any citizen in wartime. He cannot have the love of God in his heart because he does not believe with Jesus Christ that we must 'render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's.' He cannot have love for his country because he has failed to assume the burdens and duties of citizenship granted him in a free country."

The memorandum concluded that the possession of conscientious objections was sufficient in itself to justify the revocation of any teacher's certificate.

"It is most definitely against public policy and decency to permit an individual of this type to hold public employment and receive public funds in such a place that he might disseminate ideas that undermine the very structure of our society."

The Need Is Still Great!

Your response to the Fellowship's recent financial appeal has been magnificent. Your workers in the national office have been thrilled and heartened by it.

Yet the need is still great. We have ventured and are venturing great things this year. In the very midst of war we believe we have seen a vast yearning for peace and a world of brotherhood. We *must* try to direct that yearning into channels of constructive thought and action.

Our traveling secretaries are overloaded with speaking and conference engagements — they must not be held back for lack of funds.

Minority racial groups look increasingly to the FOR for help and leadership in their separate crises — they must not be let down!

Our new youth program — the Forerunners — is catching hold all over the country — it must not be allowed to weaken.

Our literature production and distribution are far greater than in peace time — and still fall far short of the need.

This Fellowship's work is a venture of profound faith. There is no backlog of money behind it; expenses and salaries are paid from month to month out of your contributions.

Can you dig a little deeper? The half-dollars and dollars are needed, too — as well as larger gifts. Will you give now — and continue giving — to human brotherhood?

Pro and Con

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.

Jews in Europe

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I think one has to discount greatly the article "Let my People Go," by Victor Gollancz, and I am surprised and shocked to think that *Fellowship* could print it.

I do not doubt that the German military has done unspeakable things, as all military does, but one has to estimate the people of a country by what they have done through the centuries. The history of Russia and of Poland is one of barbarism, but Germany was kind to the Jews for centuries when no other nation (or peoples, as the German nation is young) would tolerate them. Are we to forget that entirely?

In America the German people, generally speaking, are the kindest people I have known, and it takes more than an expanse of water to change people.

I should be greatly in favor of our doing anything that we can for people who suffer cruelly, whether Semitic or Aryan, and common decency demands that we insist upon saving lives from either violence or starvation, but there is nothing to be gained in arousing more hatred toward any people.

Since we failed in preventing the war, all we can do now is to try to shorten it and to demand mercy and justice toward all.

CORINNE HOLCOMB.

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

The article by Gollancz in *Fellowship* was a terrible and convincing one, and should stir us all to immediate action. I wonder if the FOR has in mind any definite drive to bring pressure on our government for the points that Gollancz suggests. I have personally decided to give fifteen minutes a day to this, and I fancy many FOR members would gladly do this or more. Letters to President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull, to our Senators and Congressmen, and to the papers, are the obvious things, and you may perhaps suggest others. I have had three letters in the papers so far (*Herald-Tribune, World-Telegram* and *P.M.*) and I have asked our minister to give an announcement in church, which he is to do next Sunday.

While it is doubtful if even all of us can make any impression on the government, yet I think we will all sleep better if we try, and *Fellowship* has started things.

JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN.

Right for Right's Sake

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

On the cover of the July *Fellowship* is a quotation from Herbert H. Lehman to the effect that starvation and economic anarchy are time bombs that can wreck the future chances of world peace.

I have no quarrel with that statement. It is really fine as far as it goes. Yet it is very discouraging to me, because in spite of that noble statement, it seems to me that Mr. Lehman has missed the point.

In this so-called highly developed state of society, is the elimination of starvation desirable only because otherwise it may cause another World War? How about the Golden Rule, the dignity of the human individual, our basic sense of justice? How about humanity; about being our brother's keeper? How about trying to follow a few of those enlightened principles of every religion and philosophy that we have had since the dawn of history? Are those principles mere ornaments or beautiful phrases to go in one ear and out the other? Must we do the right things *only* because we fear the violent results of not doing so?

I hope you will agree with me when I say that it is about time we start learning to do the right because it is the right, and not because we fear might.

JOSEPH A. DIPIETRO.

International Police

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

In a recent issue of *Fellowship* appeared a letter from Vernon Nash in which he stressed the importance of pacifists formulating some clear answer to the questions about the use of force which "loom largest in the interest of the general public." I agree with him whole-heartedly in this matter, and believe we owe to people in general some clearer statement about it than I have ever come across.

I should like to see some clear pacifist thinking on the matter of the creation of some kind of international police force after the war. We pacifists believe in a police force at home. Is the principle of an international police force so radically different that we cannot tolerate the thought of it? Maybe it is. But if so, what answer have we to the very pertinent question: How shall we implement a just peace if one is forthcoming?

OLIVER POWELL.

Seek Workers

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

The Philadelphia United Peace Chest is looking for a Director for the coming year who can begin work as soon as possible, devoting the remainder of the summer to fund-raising through direct personal solicitation. The Chest also will need a full time office secretary with experience in office management. It is summer work with a chance for permanent employment. Interested persons may write to Room 301, 1924 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

ETHAN ALLEN NEVIN.

From the Editors

The Readers,
FELLOWSHIP:

We are concerned that the smallness of our staff and the inadequacy of our finances make it impossible to do all that we ought to be doing during these war years. For instance, someone ought to be recording the experiences of pacifists in the widely varying situations in which they are finding themselves, so that such information will be available as needed after the war.

One particular example of this—we'll cite more in other issues—develops out of the fact that some 1,100 COs are serving in mental hospitals. Their work seems likely to contribute greatly to the weight of evidence in favor of pacifist methods. An expert in this work, who is also an FOR member, has offered to work with any of these men who wish to devote some of their time to keeping records of their experiences. How about it?

THE EDITORS.

Caesar and God

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I would like comment and enlightenment on a few points concerning the National Service Board for Religious Objectors and its relationship to the government.

As I see it now, the historic Peace Churches in their administration of Civilian Public Service camps are definitely a part of the government conscriptive and military system. They are about in the same position as the chaplains of the army and navy: they can administer with restrictions to a given body of men, but in the last analysis take their orders from a military authority. It would seem to me, if this is true, that the Peace Churches have put themselves in much the same position as the early Christians, when they first sold out to Caesar, and are only one step behind all Christian churches who minister to soldiers and sailors through their chaplains, who also obey a military authority.

The conscientious objector or pacifist who is called to meet his government's command for military service must now choose, when classified as a CO, whether to accept "remote control" through the NSBRO or meet his government on his own, accepting whatever his resistance to the conscriptive and military system brings him. To me, then, the CPS system operated by NSBRO is only a little more civilian for the CO than is the position of the CO who is in the non-combatant military service of his country.

I, who am not a member of a Peace Church, regret this feeling that they are a part of the country's military system, for their remaining aloof during the first World War gave me the inspiration and help I needed to become a pacifist. I had a secret joy in the fact that while *my* church did not, the Quakers, Brethren, and Mennonites kept "first things first" when it was hard to do so. I think their position then gave small groups in all other Christian churches the courage to form fellowships of reconciliation and peace in their own.

GRETCHEN C. BUTCHER.

How would you be in a tank?

A tank in battle is no place for a half-trained amateur. Weeks and months of intense conditioning must come first, or the tank will not reach its "maximum effectiveness" in battle.

Do you think peace-making demands less effort? It does not; it demands more. An amateur pacifist cannot point the way to a new world. Intense training must come first. Begin your training today; help build a better social order tomorrow!

Textbooks Available

PACIFIST POINT OF VIEW

Humiliation with Honor $1.00
By Vera Brittain; Foreword by Harry Emerson Fosdick

Non-Violence in an Aggressive World ..... .50
By A. J. Muste

New Testament Basis of Pacifism ..... .50
By G. H. C. Macgregor

The World Task of Pacifism ..... .10
By A. J. Muste

PACIFISM AND RACE

What the Bible Teaches About Freedom .... .05
By A. J. Muste
(Non-Violence and Jim Crow)

Interracial Primer .... .15
By Bayard Rustin

WORSHIP AND MEDITATION

With the Master.. .75
By Philippe Vernier

Prayers Personal and Social .... .10
By James Myers

A Testament of Devotion $1.00
By Thomas R. Kelly

Training for the life of the Spirit
No. 1 ..... .25
No. 2 ..... .25
By Gerald Heard

PACIFISM IN ACTION

Heroes of Good Will... .25
By Allan A. Hunter

Conscripts of Conscience .25
By R. Alfred Hassler

White Corpuscles in Europe ..... .75
By Allan A. Hunter

POST-WAR PLANNING

Shall We Rule Germany? ..... .10
By Oswald Garrison Villard

Pattern for Peacemakers .25
By R. Alfred Hassler

Comparative Peace Plans .25

The Balance of Power.. .25

Coercion of States: in Federal Unions .... .25
By the Pacifist Research Bureau

Wage Peace Now..... .15
By A. J. Muste

ESPECIALLY FOR YOUTH

Forerunners Action Kit .50
(*includes 2 studybooks, wall chart, and other material.*)

Forerunners Leader's Kit ..... .75

SPECIAL OFFER

Through the kindness of Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard, we are able to offer with each purchase of literature amounting to $2.00 or more, a free copy of *William Lloyd Garrison on Non-Resistance,* written by Mr. Villard and Fanny Garrison Villard and including a sketch by Leo Tolstoi. This offer begins August 1 and will continue in effect until the limited stock of this book is exhausted.

Literature Department

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.